INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
TANAKA, Shinichi (resumed)	23347
Direct by Fr. Blakeney (cont'd)	23349
Cross by Colonel Ivanov	23353
MORNING RECESS	23369
Cross by Colonel Ivanov (cont'd)	23370
NOON RECESS	23387
(Witness excused)	23388
HANAWA, Yoshiyuki	23390
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	23390
(Witness excused)	23394
IIMURA, Jo	23395
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	23395
Cross by Colonel Ivanov	23404
Redirect by Mr. Blakeney	23413
(Witness excused)	23414

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

(cont'd)

Defense' Witnesses	Page
YAMAMURA, Haruo	23415
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	23415
AFTERNOON RECESS	23419
Cross by Colonel Ivanov	23419
(Witness excused)	23424
Blake, Homer C., Lieutenant-Colonel, U. S. Army	23425
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	23428

INDEX

Of

EYHIBITS

	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1686	2677	Certificate of Authent by the Chief of the Archives Section of First Demobilizatio Bureau of an Imperi Headquarters Order the Commander of th Kwantung Army, date December 1941 re im settlement of the C Affair, limiting bo conflicts, etc.	the n al to mediate hina	23351
1146	2678	Affidavit of HANAWA, G	ikei	23390
1150	2679	Affidavit of IIMURA, M	inoru	23396
	2680	Affidavit of YAMAMURA,	Haruo	23415

- 1	
1	Monday, 2 June 1947
2	
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
5	FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal
6	War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan
7	
8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
9	at 0930.
10	
11	Appearances:
12	For the Tribunal, same as before.
13	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
14	For the Defense Section, same as before.
15	
16	(English to Japanese and Japanese
17	to English interpretation was made by the
18	Language Section, IMTFE.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Tolf & Kaples

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far Fast is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

IR. BLAKENEY: Upon reading the transcript of proceedings for 29 May. I have become aware for the first time of the statement of the President in connection with the affidavit of TANABE Moritake (p. 25,298), that "Unless he is crossexamined, his ... evidence may be of no value." This being precisely the state of affairs which we have feared, I wish again to point out that whereas the prosecution, with the stupendous resources of the most powerful nations of the earth at their disposal, can at will pick and choose which witnesses they will produce, the defence have no such power. On the other hand, the prosecution have every power and facility for submission of interrogatories for obtaining their own affidavits, and can in no way be thought precluded from cross-examining a witness.

"The case of TANABE bears no resemblance to those of the witnesses whom the Soviet authorities, holding prisoner in Siberia, elected not to bring into the court-room and place in the witness-box for cross-examination. The defence took the

only step available to it -- by praying exercise of the compulsory power of the Tribunal -- to produce the witness. Its prayer having been denied, it in no way acquiesces in any suggestion that the credibility of its witnesses or the weight of their testimony is affected by the absence of crossexamination.

THE PRESIDENT: A Member of the Tribunal thinks that those observations are superfluous and malicious, and he is not the Member from the U.S.S.R.

SHINICHI TANAKA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified further through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. BLAKENEY: I understand that in hearing his affidavit read the witness TANAKA, now in the box, detected some inaccuracies, which he would like to correct. I therefore ask that he be handed the original of exhibit 2,276 and be permitted to point out the places in question.

(Thereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

THE WITNESS: I shall point out the mistakes. One, under section 4 on the first page:

3 4

"At the beginning of November, 1940, the Chief of the Army General Staff (in command of the entire General Staff and responsible for the deploy-

ment of forces for national defence)" --

THE FONITOR: Mr. Blakeney, I think we had better have this witness write it out; otherwise it is impossible to follow it.

MR. BLAKENEY: I wonder if the only correction is in the date.

THE MONITOR: He is adding about two or three sentences.

THE "IITNESS: I wish to state the portion in parenthesis, beginning with "the Chief of the General Staff" to "the Vice-Chief" has been dropped in this copy.

I wish to state the next inaccuracy. This is "(4)."

MR. BLAKENEY: Page 3 of the Inglish.

THE INTERPRETER: Yes, page 3 of the English.

THE WITNESS: The following passage was omitted in the reading of the affidavit: "In case of a Soviet-Japanese war the danger of war prosecution will be confronted" -- that has been dropped.

THE INTERPRETER: Nr. Blakeney, we have just been informed that the English copy has these

1 2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

3

5

4

6

8

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

conditions. Apparently they are missing in the Japanese copy of the affidavit.

MR. BLAKENEY: If all the corrections are of that type, I believe it is a matter which can be managed by preparing a revised Japanese copy; there is no use to take the time of the Tribunal with this.

DIRECT EVAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

- Q Are they all of that type, Mr. "itness?
- A In addition, paragraph 2, under (5), includes a very serious error.
 - O Please mention that one, then.

 PR. BLAKENEY: Page 7 of the English.

A I shall mention the passage omitted. The passage omitted during the reading of my affidavit includes the following: It comes under sub-paragraph 2, in parenthesis, under 5, page 7 of the English affidavit: "The development of the German-Soviet war cannot be" --

THE MONITOR: Mr. Blakeney, do you have a better copy than this? "e seem to be having difficulty reading it.

MR. BLAKENEY: My copy is bad, too.
This has been read in English and it is

unnecessary to read it again. THE WITNESS: The entire paragraph begin-ning with "The development of the German-Soviet war cannot be so easily predicted" up to the next to the last sentenes of the same paragraph. MR. BLAKENEY: Very well, then. "e under-stand that that was omitted in reading the Japanese and has now been supplied.

 Q Is that all, Mr. Witness?

A Yes, they are all the mistakes, but I have refrained from pointing out two minor mistakes.

IR. BLAKENEY: We will see that the Japanese copy is correct.

THE FRENIDENT: We have spent 15 minutes not in correcting mistakes in substance but mistakes in copies.

MR. BLAKENEY: The absence of the order issued by Imperial Headquarters to the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army on the 3rd of December, 1941, referred to in the testimony of the witness TANAKA on page 12 of his affidavit, Section 8 (1), is no doubt sufficiently accounted for by prosecution exhibit 831 already referred to. In addition, however, I now offer in evidence defense document 1686, a certificate by the Chief of the Archives Section of the First Demobilization Bureau, that the specific document is not now in the custody of that Bureau.

THE FRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1686

will receive exhibit No. 2677.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2677 and received in evidence.)

PR. BLAKENEY: I shall not read the certificate.

You may cross-examine the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

examination I want to say the following: I refer the Honorable Tribunal to exhibits 779, 706, 708, 721-A, 724, 638, 636, 655, 839, 830, 833, 834, 835, 836, 838, 839, 667-A, 675-A, 684, 682, 686-A, 687, 689 and 690. I also draw the Tribunal's attention to the fact that in the affidavit of witness TANAKA, Shinichi too much space is devoted to his own opinions and conclusions, and it is impossible to deal with all of them here.

It would be sufficient to point out one of such conclusions as an example. This is the last paragraph of the 6th section of the affidavit, page 11 of the English translation. I am basing it on the general warnings which your Honor repeatedly addressed to the defense and the prosecution here in court, saving that the Tribunal would disregard as evidence the opinions and conclusions of witnesses.

Now I will start cross-examination.

CROS: -EXAMINATION

BA Coro

3

1

2

5

7 8

9

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

BY COLONEL IVANOV:

Q Mr. Witness, you were appointed Chief of the 1st Division of the General Staff by War Minister TOJO and Chief of the General Staff in October, 1940; was it so?

A I think I was appointed Chief of the 1st Division of the General staff by the person who held the power of appointment, namely, the Minister of War.

Q Weren't you relieved from the post of the Chief of the 1st Division of the General Staff in 1942 because your views on the plans of war began to differ from this time from that of TOJO and SUGIYAMA?

A I do not know why I was dismissed from the position of the Chief of the 1st Division, but I did not think at all that I would be dismissed because of disagreement on matters pertaining to war guidance or war plans.

Q At any rate it is possible to say that in the period from October, 1940 to December, 1942 you had been Chief of the Operations Division of the General staff and were directly connected with drafting and accomplishment of aggressive plans of Japan in China

and the South Sea areas and in the north, and were doing this under the direction of SUGIYAMA and TOJO; is that so?

A It is a fact that I worked under both General TOJO and General SUGIYAMA, but I have never engaged in the formulation or in the prosecution -- formulation of aggressive war plans or in the prosecution thereof.

Mr. Witness, will you give a direct answer? M 0 Were the operation plans against the USSR in 1941 and r S 1942, and also plans of war against Malaya, Java, e 3 Borneo and Netherland Indies and the Philippine 8 4 Islands drafted under your supervision? Answer yes S 5 1 or no. 6 Z It is a fact that I drew up operation plans 7 r

A It is a fact that I drew up operation plans by order of the chief of staff.

Q Mr. Witness, do you have at your disposal any documents bearing on the plan of the General Staff - operation plan of the General Staff of which you wrote in your affidavit? Can you produce such documents, or you have no such documents?

A I do not have any documents.

Q Thus, all that is written in your affidavit is the result of your speculations and is written from memory without real guarantee of it being correct, is that so?

A They are primarily written by my accurate memory.

O In your affidavit you contend that Japan in 1941 was threatened by the Soviet Union, is that so?

A Yes.

Q Don't you think that when the German troops in the autumn of 1941 were attempting to seize Moscow

15 16

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

and Leningrad, and German troops were near these cities, it was very strange even to think about it?

A Yes, there are reasons to think so.

Q And in 1942 when Germans reached Stalingrad and created a very grave danger for the Soviet Union in the west, was there any threat for Japan from the part of the USSR? Doesn't it contradict common sense?

A There are sufficient reasons why Japan felt a Soviet threat. Should I speak of them? Shall I state them?

Q Yes, please state them.

a state of protracted attritional war as the result of the Soviet winter offensive. Japan on her part in her war against the United States and Britain entered upon extreme and serious difficulties following the defeat at Midway in June 1942. In this period the military alignment among the United States, Britain and the USSR was very strong and we feared and estimated in accordance with the situation then existing that either the USSR alone, or the USSR combined with the United States may attack Japan from the north.

Q You are answering not my question concerning the estimation of the situation of the USSR on the west, but some other question. You are speaking about

a period which is beyond the time limit about which we speak now. The Germans were defeated at Stalingrad in December -- in November-December 1942, and this was known as a turning point of the war. Will you tell me was the period up to the end of 1942 very hard for the Soviet Union, wasn't it?

A Yes, it was a difficult period, but the Soviet-German war was already a protracted war.

O Do not you in your affidavit give conclusions of the chief of the General Staff of Japan which say, that it is very unlikely that the USSR will start war against Japan by August 1942? This estimation -- you give this estimation in your affidavit?

A That is so and the chief of the General Staff entertained such an opinion at the beginning of August. But that is an estimate that it will be -- that the danger would be relaxed tentatively or temporary because of winter and the freezing in the north would prevent any active warfare -- active operations.

O Do you know that in July 1941 Japan took decision to start secret preparations for a war against Soviet Union?

A I do not recall of any secret preparations for war against the USSR at present -- just now.

I will read to you an excerpt from exhibit

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

No. 779. This is a resolution adopted at the Imperial Conference July 2, 1941. It reads as follows:

"Though the spirit of the tripartite axis
will form the keynote of our attitude toward the
German-Soviet War, we shall not intervene for a while,
but take voluntary measures by secretly preparing arms
against the Soviet Union."

I will read one more excerpt from this resolution.

"Meanwhile, diplomatic negotiations will be continued with detailed precautions; and should the conditions of the German-Soviet war progress favourable to Japan we shall execute arms to solve the northern problems, thereby securing stability in the Northern regions."

Do you know that decision?

A Yes, I heard of that decision from the chief of staff at that time.

Why then you answered me that you didn't know about any secret preparations for a war against Soviet Union in 1941? Does the memory fail you?

A That is not a mistake in memory. I received the explanation from the chief of staff at that time that the decision did not relate to a preparation for war against the Soviet Union. Q Vill you tell me, Mr. Vitness, were the preparative measures for a war against the Soviet Union, known as Kan-tokuen, carried out from July, 1941, on the basis of this decision taken at the Imperial conference?

A The so-called Kan-tokuen of July, 1941, is not preparation for war against the U.S.S.R. It is the reinforcement of defenses vis-a-vis the Soviet Union -- defense and vigilance.

Q According to the decision taken by this
Imperial conference of July 2, 1941, it was the Kwantung
and Korean Armies which were intended to be used in case
it would be necessary to use arms against the U.S.S.R.
Is that so?

A If the situation arises which would require the exercise of armed forces, the Kwantung Army and the Korean Army would be used as a matter of course, but in the operation plans for 1941 it was also planned that reinforcements be sent from Japan proper as well as from China.

Q Was not it the purpose of Kan-tokuen in the shortest possible time to strengthen and prepare the Kwantung Army for a war aga ast the U.S.S.R.?

A The purpose of the Kan-tokuen was to reinforce and strengthen the defensive and vigilance system or

organization of the Kwantung Army because it had become extremely weak. The Kan-tokuen was not a war preparation vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. I might add that the Kan-tokuen was a plan for the reinforcement of troop strength to carry out the purposes to which I have already referred and is not an operation plan or a war plan. It does not include operational items.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Mr. Witness, your answer not only contradicts the excerpt which I read from exhibit 779, but also your statements made in your affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: We will decide those things, Colonel Ivanov. Do not carry on a conversation with the witness. Be satisfied to question him. You can comment later on his answers.

COLONI L IVANOV: Yes, sir.

Q Mr. Vitness, will you tell me, was it the General Staff or the War Ministry which drafted the instructions sent in 1941 to commanding general of the Kwantung Army UMEZU? These instructions dealt with the measures necessary for strengthening the fighting power of the army for a war against the U.S.S.R. and you mention these instructions on mage 9 of your affidavit, paragraph 2.

A It is not very clear and I should like to have it explained, but I do not think that I have stated in my affidavit anything with reference to an offensive preparation against the Soviet Union -- to strengthen offensive preparations against the Soviet Union.

Q We shall return to this question.

Now, will you tell me, was the mobilization of reserves carried out in Japan and Manchuria in the summer of 1941, starting with July, that is several

days later after Germany had attack the Soviet Union? 1 A In the effectuation of the Kan-tokuen it is 2 a fact that the first replacement reserves and the 3 second replacement reserves were called up. 4 Q hy do you in your affidavit call this mobiliza-5 tion "extraordinary mobilization"? "as it a secret 6 mobilization? 7 A I do not state that it is an emergency 8 mobilization or an extraordinary mobilization in my affidavit. 10 Q as it carried out in secrecy or not? 11 No, that should not be called mobilization. 12 It is a temporary muster order or temporary calling 13 up order. Shall I explain to you why the word 14 "mobilization" was not used? 15 Q That could have been for the purpose of 16

comeuflaging these matters. It is quite clear for a military man -- to a military man -- and it needs no explanation.

In the Japanese Army at that time the word "mebilization" was used when the organization of the army is changed from a peacetime footing to a wartime footing. But in the Kan-tokuen the Army was not placed on a war footing. Therefore, it was not a mobilization.

24

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Is it possible to explain the coincidence of such measures as the mobilization of the reservists or calling up of the reservists for a replenishment of the Kwantung Army units at the time when the Soviet-German war started? A May I have the question repeated in Japanese? It was not clear to me. (Whereupon, the question was read by the Japanese court reporter.) A Yes, the time was about the same.

*

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I shall read to you an excerpt from exhibit 830. This is a secret telegram sent on July 25, 1941, from Tokyo to Berlin by Kretschmar.

I quote page 1, paragraphs 1 and 2:

"Simultaneously for the Supreme Headquarters of the Wehrmacht and Supreme Army Headquarters.

- "1) The draft of reserves slowly beginning in Japan and Manchukuo on 10 July and the following days, suddenly reached a large and no longer concealable extent, especially in the 1st, 4th, 7th, 12th and 16th division, and continued until today in decreased strength. Until the middle of August supposedly about 900,000 reservists are to be drafted, that is the 24 to 45-year olds; among the eldest, however, only specialists like drivers, technicians, people able to speak Russian, etc. After that, another 500,000 reservists, are supposedly available.
- "2) Together with the drafting of the reservists on 10 July /orders came for/ a draft of horses, motor vehicles, etc., and a little later, instructions to firms to provide military goods of consumption, like foodstuffs, candles, and others till the end of September at the latest."

Were all these measures effectuated? I state very positively at this time that that

is not so.

by the manner in which that telegram has been written, as it gives the impression that Japan was about to accord with and to join in the German-Soviet War. That

Now, if I am to indicate the facts, the mobilization of 900,000, or the mobilization of 500,000, these are not based upon facts at all.

It also states to the effect that Japanese males from the age of 28 to 42 or somewhere around there throughout the nation of the entire nation was mobilized, or something to that effect; but this is a complete distortion. But it is a fact that call-ups were effected within the scope and requirements of the Kan-tokuen.

Q I will quote one more excerpt from exhibit 830. I quote paragraphs 5 and 6:

"5) Since about 10 July transporting of troops, beginning with quartermaster troops, technician troops and artillery of the 16th and 1st division and transport of reservists from Japan. Goal: Seishin and Rashin for troops and reservists, Tientsin and Shanghai only for reservists.

"6) Since the middle of July preparation in Manchuria for billeting and the arrival of troop

1 2

3

4

5

6

1

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

19

21

22

23

transports. In addition increased transport of military goods, which may be interpreted as the establishing of supply bases."

Do not these paragraphs of the document make any changes in your statements or in your answers?

A Such facts may have existed, but I cannot but be impressed by the over-exaggeration of the facts.

Q Mr. Witness, do not you in paragraph 4 of the sixth part of your affidavit, end of page 9 and beginning of page 10 of the English text, name the similar measures of the Kan-tokuen for the preparation of Japan for a war against the U.S.S.R.?

I will read an excerpt from your affidavit. I quote: "The main features of the so-called Kwantung Army Special Maneuver included reinforcement of the divisions stationed in Manchuria, dispatch of two divisions (one of which was diverted to South China in September), additional dispatch of forces under the direct control of the Kwantung Army such as air forces and artillery, additional dispatch of supply forces such as automobile and transport units, organization of the Kwantung Defense Headquarters to command all independent garrisons existing in Manchuria, establishment of the 20th Army Corps Headquarters, and increased supply of munitions. Also such matters required from the above items as mobilization of men, collection of materials, organization and equipment of the forces, transportation of men and materials, training, disposition and billeting of the forces were dealt with. For the mobilization of the required men the form of emergency enlistment was adopted and each unit was placed on the basis of full equipment, but not on the wartime

.

14 15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

basis."

Didn't you state that in your affidavit?

A Section 6 of my affidavit is devoted to the Kan-tokuen. I have written about it and, naturally, it was written as read. But I also recognize that there is a great divergence between the telegram you referred to sent from Tokyo to Berlin and what I have stated in my affidavit.

Q When comparing these two documents we don't see great difference between the two. Do not all measures of the Kan-tokuen named in your affidavit and in Kretschmar's telegram coincide?

A Yes, there are differences. Let me state them: First of all the telegram sent to Germany, from what I presume was the German military attache, was written on the premise that the Kan-tokuen was a preparation for war against the Soviet Union, whereas the real purpose of the Kan-tokuen in Japan was passive and negative in nature, and that it was for the purpose of reinforcing the defense and vigilance of our troops. On this point there is a very great difference.

Q You are speaking about other question which was not asked of you. I ask you to state briefly whether there is coincidence or differences between your affidavit and the document which I read; whether

1 2

4 5

there is more coincidences than differences, that is between your affidavit and telegram sent by Kretschmar. Answer briefly.

A There are very important, vital differences. For instance, there is a very great difference in the number of troops to be sent to Manchuria.

COLONEL IVANOV: I ask the honorable Tribunal to decide about the coincidence and differences between these two documents.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Greenberg & Lefler

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

BY COLONEL IVANOV (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, before the recess I told you that we shall return to one of the questions. Now, I return to this question. I will read to you an excerpt from your affidavit, paragraph 2 on page 9 of the English text. You probably simply forgot the contents of that part of your affidavit, and, therefore, you could not answer my question. I will remind you of its contents. I quote:

"Then, in July of 1941, on the occasion of the so-called Kwantung Army Special Maneuver, the Imperial Headquarters gave an instruction to the commander of the Kwantung Army to the effect that the purpose of reinforcement, the so-called Kwantung Army Special Maneuver, was to strengthen preparedness against the USSR."

Then, if these instructions, as you state, were sent to the commander of the Kwantung Army, General UNEZU, by the Imperial Headquarters, then in the drafting of that instruction, TOJO and the chief of the General Staff took part, dian't they?

A The order was issued by the Imperial Head-

quarters, but the order itself was drafted by the chief of staff of the Army who, upon drafting it, consulted with the War Minister -- it is a fact that following the drafting of the order the chief of the General Staff consulted the Minister of War. However, upon hearing that passage read to me, I cannot say

Q You even could not remember the instructions itself and its contents.

and I would not say that this is in contradiction to

what I have stated so far.

I pass to the next question. Mr. Witness, will you tell 7e, did not the 1st Division of the General Staff under your general supervision draft the operation plans of war against the USSR in 1941 and 1942?

A I think the use of the words "war operational plans" would invite misunderstanding. However, it is a fact that in the General Staff office annual plans with regard to possible war against the Soviet Union were drawn up.

Q Why, then, you; in your affidavit, enlarging upon the situation and the operational plan of the General Staff for 1941, do not mention what Soviet cities it was planned to seize by the Japanese troops on the first stage of war and what cities it was

,

planned to seize on the second stage of the war? Maybe you will remember now.

A Is that with respect to the plan for 1941?

Yes, in respect to the plan which was drafted at the beginning of the year.

A I have stated somewhat at length the reasons for the operational plans which were drawn up at the beginning of 1941. I have stated and explained the bases upon which the operational plans for that year was drawn up, because I felt that by understanding the fundamental bases upon which the plans were drawn up would convey a better understanding of Japan and the situation she was then in.

Q In your affidavit, you avoided stating the contents of the operational plans in their substance. The most important thing is not the preliminary remarks to the plan but its contents. Will you tell me what Soviet cities did the Japanese troops plan to seize during the campaign of 1941 -- as provided by the plan of 1941? Answer briefly and exactly to the question.

A Before replying, I should like to state a few words. It appears from the question just asked that Japan was planning an agressive war. That is not so. What I wish to reply to is this: it is the

1 2

planned to seize on the second stage of the war? Maybe you will remember now.

A Is that with respect to the plan for 1941?

Yes, in respect to the plan which was drafted at the beginning of the year.

A I have stated somewhat at length the reasons for the operational plans which were drawn up at the beginning of 1941. I have stated and explained the bases upon which the operational plans for that year was drawn up, because I felt that by understanding the fundamental bases upon which the plans were drawn up would convey a better understanding of Japan and the situation she was then in.

Q In your affidavit, you avoided stating the contents of the operational plans in their substance. The most important thing is not the preliminary remarks to the plan but its contents. Will you tell me what Soviet cities did the Japanese troops plan to seize during the campaign of 1941 -- as provided by the plan of 1941? Answer briefly and exactly to the question.

A Before replying, I should like to state a few words. It appears from the question just asked that Japan was planning an agressive war. That is not so. What I wish to reply to is this: it is the

1 2

operational plans after war breaks out. May I go on?

Q You answer this simple question, please.

Lid the plan of 1941 provide for the seizure of any
Soviet cities or not? Answer yes or no.

A Then, I shall answer yes or no. The Japanese Army would, after the operational plan takes effect -- was to strike an offensive eastward and to destroy the bases for long range bombing.

Q I will read to you an excerpt from exhibit No. 834 concerning the plan of war against the USSR. This plan was drawn up by the Japanese General Staff for 1941. This testimony was given by Lieutenant Colonel SEJIMA, Ruizo, former officer of the 1st Division of the General Staff. I quote:

"According to the operational plan for the year 1941 (Showa 16) the Kwantung Army was to concentrate its main forces in the direction of the Maritime Provinces, a part of its forces in the direction of Blagoveshchensk and Kuivshevska, and another part in the neighborhood of Hailar while the reserve was to be concentrated in Harbin in the event of a Russo-Japanese war. The offensive was to be taken from the Sui-Ren Ho district towards and from the Hei-Ho district towards the Blagoveshchensk and Kuivshevska districts. Plans were made for the forces in the

neighborhood of Hailar to take a defensive position in order to protect offensive operations in other areas. The aim of the offensive operations in the Maritime Provinces was to occupy that area, while the offensive in the Blagoveshchensk and Kuivshevska districts was meant to cut the railway, to make reinforcement and supply from the west possible.

"In the first phase of the war, they expected to occupy Voroshilov, Vladivostok, Blagovesh-chensk, Iman, Kuibyshovka and Rukhlovo, while in the second phase, they expected as far as the situation permitted, to occupy North Sakhalin, Port Petropaviovsk of Kamchatka, Nikolayevsk of the Amur River, Komsomolsk and Sorgavan."

Mr. Witness, do you in your affidavit mean as protracted defense at the beginning of the war precisely this plan of seizure of Soviet territories on the first and second stage of the war?

A That is not so. With the commencement of operations, the Japanese Army would take a position for a long -- that is, protracted defensive operations in the frontier districts of Manchuria and Soviet Russia. That is what I am referring to.

Q Do you know, Mr. Witness, that the General Staff of Japan issued instructions to the headquarters

1 2

4 5

neighborhood of Hailar to take a defensive position in order to protect offensive operations in other areas. The aim of the offensive operations in the Maritime Provinces was to occupy that area, while the offensive in the Blagoveshchensk and Kuivshevska districts was meant to cut the railway, to make reinforcement and supply from the west possible.

"In the first phase of the war, they expected to occupy Voroshilov, Vladivostok, Blagovesh-chensk, Iman, Kuibyshovka and Rukhlovo, while in the second phase, they expected as far as the situation permitted, to occupy North Sakhalin, Port Petropaviovsk of Kamchatka, Nikolayevsk of the Amur River, Komsomolsk and Sorgavan."

Mr. Witness, do you in your affidavit mean as protracted defense at the beginning of the war precisely this plan of seizure of Soviet territories on the first and second stage of the war?

A That is not so. With the commencement of operations, the Japanese Army would take a position for a long -- that is, protracted defensive operations in the frontier districts of Manchuria and Soviet Russia. That is what I am referring to.

Q Do you know, Mr. Witness, that the General Staff of Japan issued instructions to the headquarters

1 2

of the Kwantung Army providing for the drafting of the operational plan of war against the USSR in 1942?

A With regard to the operational plan for the fiscal year of 1942, it is my recollection that the outline was drawn up by the General Staff office of the Army, and the Kwantung Army was directed to act in accordance with this outline and prepare the details of the plan.

Q Do you know Major General MATSUMURA, Tomokatsu, former chief of the Russian Sector of the 2nd Section of the 2nd Division of the General Staff and later Vice-Chief of the Headquarters of the Kwantung Army?

A I know him.

Q I will read an excerpt from exhibit 836, the affidavit of Major General MATSUMURA Tomokatsu. I quote:

"1) Having arrived at the Headquarters of the Kwantung Army in the 18th year of Showa (1943), I, as the Chief of the Strategy Section, was first of all informed of the operations plan kept by the Headquarters. At this time I was informed of the directives of the Army General Staff concerning the operations plan against Soviet Russia for the 17th year of Showa (1942) and the operations plan itself

1 2

3

5

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of the Kwantung Army Headquarters based upon the 2 said directives.

"The directives of the Army General Staff 4 instructed the Kwantung Army Headquarters to form an 5 operations plan against Soviet Russia with the occu-6 pation of the Maritime Provinces of Soviet Russia and 7 the destruction of the air-bases in the Maritime 8 Province as the general objectives, and also to focus the principal attack upon Voroshilov. It was also written in the directives that the Kwantung Army should make preparations for further operations after occupation of the Maritime Provinces."

Mr. Witness, will you tell me, do you call these operations for seizure of the Maritime Provinces passive offensive? Don't you understand, under the term of active offensive, the seizure of the Siberia and the Urals?

A Whether the offensive is a negative one or a passive one, that would be merely the form of strategy. But, you say that the occupation of the Maritime Province is negative and the occupation of the Urals and other areas were negative. That has no connection whatsoever with the matter. At the outset of the operations, the Japanese Army was to take a stand for a protracted defense. Meanwhile,

1

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

following the completion of operational preparations, different, new action would be taken. This was called a passive offensive, and that was the operations that was to be taken by the Kwantung Army.

Mr. Witness, tell me, was not it planned to include the Soviet Far East into the so-called Greater East Asia Sphere? Do you know anything about it?

The question of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere is a political question with which the General Staff has no connection whatsoever. However --

I will read to you an excerpt from exhibit 6754. This is an article of the accused, HASHIMOTO, Kingoro, published on January 5, 1942. I quote:

"Then I should like to think that the Greater East Asia Sphere includes the undermentioned countries."

I omit several lines and continue to quote further:

"Japan, Manchukuo, China, the Soviet Far East, French Indo-China, Burma, Malay, the Dutch East Indies, India, Afghanistan, Australia, New Zealand, Hawaii, Philippines, and the islands of the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

"We cannot yet decide whether all these countries should be incorporated at once in the Sphere under Imperial Influence, but it is at least absolutely necessary to include for the sake of national defense these countries in the sphere of our influence."

Didn't the operation plans of the General Staff for 1941-42 reflect in some measure these, although political but still aggressive, intentions of the ruling circles of Japan -- intentions which were expressed by HASHIMOTO, Kingoro?

Such opinions or views are not reflected in the operations plans drawn up by the General Staff. HASHIMOTO, Kingoro, as far as I know, is just one of the common people, a civilian, and at that time had no position of leadership or influence in matters of this kind.

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

Spratt & Yelden

Q But still I think that you shall not deny that the operation plans directed against the Soviet Union, Burma, Netherlands, Australia, Netherlands Indies and other peaceful countries were drafted by the General Staff, by the First Division of the General Staff?

A We were formulating operations plans for defensive purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean by that; defensive against Australia, for instance?

THE WITNESS: Operations plans as regards Australia never existed.

THE PRESIDENT: It is the first time you have said it.

THE WITNESS: There are none -- or there were none.

MR. BLAKENEY: I would like to point out, if the Tribunal please, that the only suggestion of operations plans against those countries came from the prosecutor. The witness never discussed it before then.

THE PRESIDENT: The position is not so plain. He was asked a question which included Australia and he was satisfied to say that plans were defensive. He has now said Australia was not included, which is

another matter. Will you answer my questions yes or no and in no other way, please? 3 Did the First Division of the General Staff 4 draft any operation plans against the Philippines, yes 5 or no? 6 When? 7 In 1941? 8 Yes, Philippines was included in the annual 9 plan drawn up for the fiscal year 1941. 10 Was there any plan against Netherlands 11 Indies at the same time, yes or no? 12 13 A No. Was there any such plan directed against 14 0 15 Java and Burma, yes or no? 16 A No. Was there any plan, any such plan, against 17 0 18 Malaya? 19 The idea of operations existed. A 20 COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, in rebuttal 21 the prosecution will produce interrogations of TANAKA, 22 Shinichi -- interrogations conducted by the prosecution 23 THE PRESIDENT: Is that the man who gave 24 evidence? 25

COLONEL IVANOV: Yes, the same person gave

evidence during those interrogations but unfortunately we cannot use them now because they are not ready for being used in the courtroom now.

THE PRESIDENT: Put to him the evidence
TANAKA gave here but do not go beyond that to interrogations that preceded the evidence. I am thinking
of the other TANAKA.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. President, he is referring to the witness now on the stand and we would like to call upon the prosecution, if they have the intention of confronting the witness -- of producing interrogations of this witness -- to confront him with them now rather than at some other time.

COLONEL IVANOV: I have already explained to the Honorable Tribunal that they cannot produce these documents now because they are not processed. The prosecution has the right to produce them in rebuttal.

MR. BLAKENEY: Under the rules prevailing in this Tribunal they have the duty to confront the witness with any matter which they propose to use as impeachment of his testimony. Processed or not, the evidence could be put to the witness now.

COLONEL IVANOV: I don't know any such rules in the practice of the Tribunal and I think such

3 4

rules never existed before. I stated simply that
this witness was interrogated by the prosecution and
that certain documents will be produced during rebuttal,
and I meant nothing more.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no rule which prevents you from following that course, Colonel Ivanov, but if you don't give the witness an opportunity of answering these interrogations while he is here you weaken the effect of his answers to the interrogations. Your rebuttal evidence will not be strong, or so strong as it might be.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I would gladly follow your advice. Unfortunately, the documents are not processed and they are not prepared to be produced. I have at my disposal no English and Japanese version of the text now.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov, if these interrogations go merely to credibility you cannot use them in rebuttal unless you put them to the witness now.

COLONEL IVANOV: I pass on to the next question.

Mr. Witness, in your affidavit you call the operational plans of a war against the USSR "defensive" plans. Did not the Japanese General Staff during the

1 2

last two decades draft plans of attacking the Soviet Union and seizure of the Soviet territories?

A I don't know all about the twenty years of the General Staff Office. I went to the General Staff for the first time in 1940. At that time when I perused the documents in the General Staff Office I found no evidence whatsoever of any plans for an offensive against the Soviet Union during the past twenty years, and I discovered to what extent the General Staff had racked his brains and made every effort possible to defend -- for defensive purposes while being somewhat apprehensive of Japan's situation in the face of Soviet strength.

4 5

g I shall read to you the following statement of Japanese Ambassador OSHIMA made by him on the 18th of April, 1943, to Ribbentrop. I quote from exhibit 839-A, page 1:

"Ambassador OSHIMA explained that he did not know the views of his Government but understood that for the last 20 years all plans of the General Staff had been worked out for an attack on Russia and were still directed towards such an attack. If success in that direction could in any way be expected, they would certainly attack."

Ivanov, for the general information that some Members of the Tribunal are apprehensive at the number of references made by you, more particularly, to the giving of evidence in rebuttal. I cannot say that there is complete unanimity on this point among all Members of the Bench. However, you will have to consider seriously whether evidence you propose to tender in rebuttal may not be rejected. I cannot say just how the Members will vote on any such issue, but it is a consideration for you, Colonel Ivanov, not to assume too much about tendering evidence in rebuttal. I cannot say whether the Members of the Tribunal will adhere to the technical rules, and if

.8

they decide to adhere whether they will agree upon what they are. They may differ in different countries, and they do.

colonel IVANOV: Your Honor, I will take into consideration all that you have said, but now the question is only of one interrogation. The present examination is concerned only with one document.

Q Mr. Witness, can you tell me what units were transferred from the Kwantung Army late in autumn, 1941, to the Southern Regions?

A I have deposed with respect to the units which were sent between September and November, 1941, that is transferred. The troops transferred included the following:

One division, three tank regiments, three heavy artillery regiments -- that is, five artillery regiments -- 24 anti-aircraft companies, three headquarters of the air corps, four fighter squadrons, three light bomber squadrons, two heavy bomber squadrons, five companies of reconnaissance, and also, in addition, ground crews, that is ground airforce. These were the principal troops which were transferred, but there were also others.

Q What sort of airforce units were in the

2

1

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

> 20 21

22 23

24

25

Far East at the beginning of 1942, according to your estimation? Do you recall the number of units and types of the planes? Vill you state the number of units and the types of the planes?

A What I have stated in my affidavit is not my estimate. That is the intelligence in the possession of the Second Division of the General Staff Office, and the estimate made by the General Staff with regard to Soviet air strength in the Far East was 1200 planes. Broken down, they included 60 heavy bombers, 80 long-distance bombers, 330 light bombers, 450 fighter planes, 60 assault planes, 200 sea planes. That is roughtly the figures of the various types of planes, and they total 1200 approximately.

Mr. Witness, do you have sufficient trustworthy documentary data concerning the units of the Soviet Army in the Far East in the period 1940-42?

A At present I do not have any documents.

All numerical data concerning Soviet troops in the Far East given in your affidavit, you gave from memory, is that so?

Those figures come from my very reliable, accurate memory. Following the war's end, I had a number of conversations and talks with my

subordinates on these very matters and confirmed my memory; that is, my former subordinates.

Q I am not interested in that now. Mr. Witness, will you tell me, you, being Chief of the First Division of the Japanese General Staff, were responsible for drafting of operational plans of a war against the Soviet Union and the United States, Great Britain, and China in the period from 1940-1942, were not you? Answer briefly "yes" or "no."

A No, the responsibility rests with the Chief of the Army General Staff.

Q Had you admitted the operational plans which were drawn up by the General Staff of Japan in 1941-42 under your supervision, plans directed against the U. S. S. R., United States, Great Britain, and China, were aggressive, had you admitted that then, you would have been responsible for these plans as an alleged war criminal, wouldn't you?

THE PRESIDENT: That is argumentative.

COLONEL IVANOV: That is all, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: "e will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Thereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

1

2

f 5 & 6 K 7

p 8 1 e 9 a u 10

12

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

20

19

22

24

25

at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: There is no re-examination.

May the witness be released on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: Returning again to the affidavit of Lieutenant-General TOMINAGA, prosecution exhibit 705, I read another short excerpt. In the part read by the prosecution General TOMINAGA stated that in 1940 he drew an aggression plan against USSR. As showing that this so-called aggression plan was nothing more than an operations plan, I read his further explanation from page 5 of the affidavit, commencing with the fifth question.

"Q When was the time of aggression against U.s.s.R. by the plan?

"A In this plan the time of opening War

was not indicated, because it should be decided by 1 the Emperor, after discussion in the Supreme Council. 2 "Q Where was the plan preserved after the 3 Imperial sanction? 4 "A It was preserved in Operation Section 5 of 1st Department of General Staff Headquarters. 6 "Q To whom was the copy of the plan sent? 7 "A The copy of the plan was sent to the 8 Kwantung Army. 9 "Q What kinds of measures were taken to 10 11 carry this plan into practice? 12 "A A senior officer (whose name I forgot) 13 went with this plan and handed it over to the 14 Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army to put it 15 into practice." 16 I omit the next question and answer already 17 read and read the next. 18 "Q When was it sent to the Kwantung 19 Army to put into practice? 20 "A At the beginning of April of 1940." 21 I now call as a witness HANAWA, Gikei, 22 who will testify by his affidavit, defense document 23 No. 1146. 24

YOSHIYUKI HANAWA, called as a 1 witness on behalf of the defense, being 2 first duly sworn, testified through 3 Japanese interpreters as follows: 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. BLAKENEY: Q Will you state, Mr. Witness, your name and 7 residence, please. 8 My name is HANAWA, Yoshiyuki; my address No. 12, 4-Chome Tatekawa, Sumida-ku, Tokyo. 10 MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be 11 handed defense document No. 1146. 12 13 (whereupon, the document above 14 referred to was handed to the witness.) 15 I ask you, Mr. Witness, to examine that and 16 state whether it is your affidavit, signed and 17 sealed by you? 18 This is my affidavit. 19 Q Are the contents thereof true and correct? 20 Α Yes. 21 MR. BLAKENEY: The affidavit, defense document 22 No. 1146 is offered in evidence. 23 THE FRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 24 CTERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 25 No. 1146 will receive exhibit No. 2678.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2678 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I shall read the affidavit, omitting formal parts.

"During the four years from the time I arrived at Hsinking as counsellor of the Japanese Embassy in Manchoukuo, on 12 November 1940, until the time when General UMEZU, appointed Chief of the General Staff, left for Tokyo at the end of August 1944, I worked under him. I believe that I am one of those who best know his character and his political ideas.

"Ambassador UMEZU's first principle was maintenance of peace and order in Manchoukuo; he adopted the policy of having no trouble with the Soviet for the sake of the healthy progress of Manchoukuo; he instructed the Chief of General Affairs Board TAKEBE, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs SHIMOMURA, and myself who was in charge of the Japanese Diplomatic Mission. This principle of his was strengthened after the outbreak of the Pacific War. The fact that he decided all questions according to this principle is clearly demonstrated by the following examples:

"In the middle of December 1942, as
Japanese Ambassador and Commander-in-Chief of the
Kwantung Army, UMEZU went to Tokyo to report on
Manchoukuo's general condition and at this occasion
he reported to the Emperor that he was devoting his
utmost efforts to keeping peace with the Soviet.
After he came back to Hsinking he told me that his
report satisfied the Emperor, as His Majesty was
also worried about Soviet relations, and that the
Emperor instructed him to see that all instructions
regarding this matter reach thoroughly to his
subordinates.

"Immediately after I arrived at Hsinking at the end of 1940, I heard the report that IsoMURA, who was in charge of information (Kwantung Army) told a member of the Embassy staff that UMEZU, in settling the Nomonhan Incident, strictly instructed his men that any border incident be settled by consultation with Tokyo. Following the outbreak of the Pacific War, his ideal, as he became more careful, found expression in many ways in Manchoukuoan politics; for example, in 1943 a Public Administration Order was issued to frontier officials to the effect that when floating timber on border rivers reached Manchoukuo territory, it should not be dealt with

directly but instructions from the central government in Hsinking must be waited.

7 8

"In Dairen, in 1943, he invited the Dairen police chief to visit him and advised him to be careful as to activities against personnel of the Soviet Consulate by way of prevention of espionage, due to the complicated international relations and such people's status as foreign diplomats. As a result, if I remember correctly there was no trouble concerning relations with the Soviet in Dairen.

"Shortly after his visit to Dairen, he visited Harbin and gave the same advice to the Chief of the Special Services Section, Major General DOI. In Harbin there were minor troubles -- what might be considered as the revenge for Soviet pressure on Japanese Consulaire personnel in Chita and Blagoveshchensk. It was, however, all settled by Manchoukuo's compliance.

"About July 1942, when the German Minister
Wagner visited him to sound the intention of the
Kwantung Army concerning Japan's joining the RussoGerman War, he expressed his opinion that it would
be most advantageous for Japan to concentrate on
the Greater East Asia War even though the question
of Japan's joining the Russo-German War was a matter

for Tokyo to decide, and thus he gave him indirectly
the impression that he was against it."

You may cross-examine.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I refer the

Members of the Tribunal to six exhibits. Their numbers are 670, 723, 731, 736, 737, 738, 740.

The prosecution do not desire to cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: May the witness be released on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BLAKENEY: My next witness is IIMURA, Minoru, whose affidavit is defense document 1150.

I must call the Tribunal's attention to
the fact that there is another affidavit by the
witness IIMURA, which through inadvertence has not
yet been served and therefore cannot be offered at
this time, but I should like permission to recall
him after the requirements of service have been
complied with for the presentation of that additional
evidence.

1	JO II!! URA, called as a witness on behalf	
	of the defense, being first duly sworn, testi-	
2	fied through Japanese interpreters as follows:	
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
4	BY MR. BLAKENEY:	
5	O Mr. Witness, please state your name and	
6	residence.	
7		
8	A IIMURA, Jo, No. 201 2-chome Soshigaya,	
9	Setagaya-ku, Tokyo.	
10	MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be	
11	handed defense document 1,150.	
12	(Whereupon, a document was handed	
13	to the witness.)	
14	Q I ask you, Mr. Witness, to examine that	
15	document and state whether it is your affidavit.	
16	signed and sealed by you.	
17	A This document has my signature and seal.	
18	. Are the contents of the document true and	
19	correct?	
20	A True and correct.	
21	MR. BLAKENEY: I now offer in evidence	
22		
23	the affidavit, defense document 1,150.	
24	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual	
25	terms.	

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document

1150 will receive exhibit No. 2679.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2679 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I shall read the affidavit with the exception of the third paragraph on page 2, which I shall omit. I also omit the formal parts.

"I was appointed Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army at the same time that General UMEZU was appointed Commander-in-Chief, on 7 September 1939, and held that post until October 1940. In October 1941, I was appointed Commander of the 5th Army, which had its headquarters in Tongan on the Manchoukuo-Soviet border, and there served under the command of General UNEZU for two years, until October 1943.

"I. Our first duty as newly-appointed subordinates under General UNEZU in September 1939 was to settle the Nomonhan Incident, according to Tokyo's instructions. Upon his appointment, General UNEZU gave us instructions, the main points of which were as below:

"(1) Study withdrawal of the border guard line and other matters in order to prevent border

troubles in future.

"(2) All subordinates were to understand General UMEZU's intentions well and were not allowed to deviate from his intentions.

"(3) Subordinates were always to keep their commander-in-chief very well informed. "Then important matters were being investigated or planned the main points were to be reported to the commander-in chief first, and then investigation in detail should be made. Plans were, even while in progress, to be reported to the commander-in-chief, and were to be gradually completed according to his instructions.

"During the full year when I served as chief of staff all subordinates were completely under General UMEZU's command concerning his abovementioned policies. This complete control over his men by UMEZU was not only over them but also extended down to all troops under his command. I believe this complete command by Umezu over his men was based upon his firm determination not to cause border troubles like the Nomonhan Incident."

Omitting the next paragraph:

"II. UMEZU's efforts in Preventing Border Troubles.

1 2

"(1) The 'Border Guard Regulations of the 1 Kwantung Army." 2 "The 'Border Guard Regulations' were made 3 by the commander-in-chief and his subordinates 4 together, being based on UMEZU's instructions given 5 upon his appointment and running parallel to the 6 settlement of the Nomonhan Incident, in order to 7 8 avoid border troubles. 9 "I shall explain below concerning the 10 'Border Guard Regulations' according to what I 11 recall from my memory. 12 "a. Complete prevention of border troubles 13 was to be the principle. 14 "b. A Border Guard Line was to be estab-15 lished behind the border, except in places where 16 the border was very clear, and troop activities 17 were prohibited beyond the Border Guard Line. 18 "c. The area between the Border Guard 19 Line and the border was to be made a non-militarized 20 zone. Only patrol parties made up of very small 21 numbers of men might be dispatched to the non-mili-22

tarized zone, if any were required.

"d. A patrol party of course, and even

troops stationed on or inside the Border Guard Line,

were prohibited the use of arms except in case of

23

24

absolute necessity for self-defense. (Transfer of troops in case of border trouble might not be done without operation orders from the commander-in-chief; this was particularly explained at the time the 'Border Guard Regulations' were ordered.)

"e. Even in case of illegal crossing of the border by Soviet planes, counter-attack by plane was strictly prohibited, though ground fire might be used.

"f. If an incident occurred on the border it was to be reported immediately to higher
headquarters (including Kwantung Army Headquarters).
Such reports were to be given priority over everything else.

"As was mentioned above, the 'Border Guard Regulations' were made according to UMEZU's intention, based upon current general conditions and Tokyo policy, to avoid any border troubles and keep peace in the north. Based on these 'Border Guard Regulations', every field commander made his 'border guard regulations' in detail. However, a field commander was not alone responsible for making these, but it was only permitted after close investigation by UNEZU himself.

"UFEZU also made strong representations

to the Manchoukuoan side concerning prevention of 1 border troubles, since vacant places along the border -- not guarded by the Japanese army -- were 3 guarded by the l'anchoukuoan police.

"(2) Other Efforts of UMEZU to Avoid Border Troubles.

"It was UMEZU's firm determination from the time of his appointment to avoid border troubles in order to keep peace in the north. His determination was further strengthened, I believe, when the Emperor gave him advice concerning peace in the north at the time he went to Tokyo in Tecember 1939.

"The fact that there was not a border clash even once in his long term of five years in the Kwantung Army is clear evidence of this.

"The Emperor's advice was conveyed to us at the office of the commander-in-chief and also at the Army Commanders concerences, in December 1939. UMEZU used to have army commanders conferences once or twice a year. At every conference, including of course the first conference in October 1939 he called his men's attention to prevention of border troubles by saying: 'A fire must be stopped while it is small. If border trouble unfortunately happens -- though it should have been prevented

2

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

beforehand -- it is desired that the army commander be on the spot to prevent expansion of the incident. I myself will go to the spot in order to settle it.' The state of affairs concerning prevention of border trouble was always included in the reports of army commanders to the Army Commanders Conference. This situation was always true throughout my term as chief of staff, and also during my term as commander of the 5th Army under the command of UNEZU after October 1941.

toward prevention of border troubles immediately after reporting as commander of the 5th Army in October 1941, I recognized that the 'Border Guard Regulations' had been very well brought home to every man; and a term 'prevention of border trouble' was common among the men. All this was good evidence that UMEZU's wishes had been well drilled into all men under his command. In addition to giving instructions, UMEZU not only went himself, but also sent his staff officers to the front whenever there were chances for inspection to see how his order was being carried out. I also inspected the eastern front many times.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

"Following the outbreak of the Pacific
"ar, UMFZU, realizing the necessity of keeping
peace in the north, again issued written instructions to avoid border troubles, as well as inspecting the whole front line himself for the purpose of preventing trouble. I received this order
at Tonan 4.0.

""That I want to state further is UMEZU's attitude toward reinforcement of the Kwantung Army while I was chief of staff. "e subordinates were very much worried about the defence of Manchoukuo, as the troops had sustained losses and the real power of the Soviet had become clear, as it was right after the Nomonhan Incident, and we used to feel uneasiness just after the ice melted on the frontier rivers. Though we subordinates wanted reinforcement, UNEZU would not permit our proposed reinforcement, saying, 'We are in the middle of the China Incident and its settlement is most needed. At this time we should not ask Tokyo for reinforcement of the Kwantung Army; the shortage of manpower can be made up for by preventing border troubles end by strengthening border fortifications.' One division (the 25th Division) was reinforced efter the Momonhan Incident, but this was not by UMEZU's

.

ī

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

DIRECT

proposal. 1 "After the outbreak of the Pacific war 2 (I was then the commander of the 5th Army) a con-3 4 siderable number of men was taken away from the 5 Kwantung Army, but UMFZU told us that we should be 6 glad to sacrifice man-power because of general con-7 ditions as a whole. At this time also we were un-8 easy because of the proportion between their strength 9 and ours. 10 "All I have stated above is, I believe, 11 good evidence of UMEZU's unchangeable, firm deter-12 mination to keep peace in the north." 13 "ith the Tribunal's permission I wish to 14 ask one or two additional questions. 15 BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued): 16 O Mr. Witness, when did you arrive at your 17 post of Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army? 18 A About three days prior to the arrival of 19 Commanding General UMEZU. 20 Are you able to state the date upon which 21 General UMEZU arrived? 22 A I think it was the 8th of September, 1939. 23 MR. BLAKENEY: You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

M	
0	
r	
S	
е	
&	
S	
0	
1	
Z	
e.	
r	

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY COLONEL IVANOV:

Q Mr. Witness, in your affidavit you give the text of UMEZU'S statements made in 1939 and put them into inverted comas. Do you do this from memory, do you? Don't you?

A I do not understand, but what do you mean by putting into parenthesis?

Q You give in your affidevit the words said by UMEZU and placed them into inverted comas, and thus you quote these words. Are you doing this from memory?

A Will you tell me -- give me the subject matter because that alone -- does not enlighten me at all as to what you mean by -- if you will indicate the location and contents thereof I may be able to answer your question more intelligently.

THE PRESIDENT: He refers to UMEZU's statement, "the fire must be stopped, etc."

A (Continuing) I said this because my memory on that matter is very fresh because General UMEZU reperted this frequently.

Q There is a second UMEZU statement which is given at the end of your affidavit and which is placed also in inverted comas, that is the words, "We are in

the middle of the China Incident, etc." Do you quote that also from memory?

A Yes, from memory.

Q Can the words uttered by UMEZU eight years ago and quoted by you from memory be trustworthy?

Maybe this is the result of your imagination.

A This matter is very clearly among my recollections.

Q Mr. Witness, you state in your affidavit that while UMEZU for five years held the post of the commander of the Kwantung Army there was not a single border incident, didn't you?

A There are no important or serious border incidents.

Q And you, yourself, were only for three years during this period in the Kwantung Army and you take the liberty to state the facts which you did not witness?

A I can state very positively with respect to those three years. With respect to other matters I am able to learn through newspapers and other documents but I cannot speak of them -- whenever any incidents arise, but I cannot speak of them.

Q So you continue to state that at that period there was not a single border incident, do you?

.

1

2

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

I am stating very positively that there were no serious border incidents such as the Nomonhan Incident and the Changkufeng Incident and the Chang Kan-tzu Incident.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, in my following questions I will use facts, or I will use data given in exhibit 750. These are information concerning the number of violations of the U.S.S.R. border -received from the chief of the frontier guard corps of the U.S.S.R., commander of the frontier guard corps of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Witness, do you know that the Japanese military in 1940 violated the Soviet state border fifty-nine times?

I do not know.

And do you know that in 1941 there were 136 violations of the state border? In 1942, 229 violations; in 1943 the number of violations was at its highest from 1932 and that was 414 violations of the state border of the Soviet Union by the Japanese military?

I do not know.

Do you know, Mr. Witness, that during the violations of territorial waters of the U.S.S.R. in 1940 the Soviet authorities held up eighteen ships and

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

in 1942 thirty-six ships?

I do not know.

Mr. Witness, do you know that the number of violations of the state border of the U.S.S.R. by Japanese planes increased continuously and was as follows: in 1940 fifty-six violations; in 1940 sixty-one violetions; in 1942 eighty-two violations, and in 1943 one hundred nineteen violations of the Soviet state border?

I do not know.

Does your memory fail you that you do not remember the violations of the Soviet frontier which occurred at the time you were chief of staff at the headquarters of the Kwantung Army?

I do not remember such figures as just given.

In your affidavit you state that the cause of the incidents at the state borders were the expenditure of the so-called special secret funds. Won't you state for what purposes was these funds assigned -- were these funds spent -- correction?

20

21

22 23

24

MR. BLAKENEY: Counsel is now attempting to cross-examine on a portion of the affidavit not read in evidence and I, therefore, object.

THE PRESIDENT: It was tendered in evidence but not read. He can cross-examine on it at the present stage. It is still in evidence, although not read.

Q Will you answer this question?

A According to the prosecutor there seems to be some relation—he seems to point to some relation—ship between border incidents and special funds. I have not spoken about that in my affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: No. He refers to undesirable incidents and what they are we do not know.

Q I will put a moredirect question to you.

Were not these funds spent on financing the subversive activities against the Soviet Union:

A I have no recollection that it was used for strategic purposes against the Soviet Union, that is to say, for any subversive purposes against the Soviet Union.

Q Mr. Witness, do you remember what questions were discussed in February, 1940, in Harbin at the conference of the chiefs of the Japanese Special agencies -- Special Service Agency?

A I do not know.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q I will remind you. I will read an excerpt from exhibit 736 bearing upon the materials of the conference of the chiefs of the Japanese Special Service organizations in February, 1940. I quote page 1:

"Revision of the Inti-Soviet Sabotage activities and of guidance of White Russians in keeping with the revisions.

"Army Special Service Organization at Harbin.

"A Reform of the Anti-Soviet sabotage activities. The idea we have hitherto had regarding the anti-Soviet srbotage activities was to use the individual sabotage units under the direct leadership of the Japanese military authorities. However, to make this more effective in future, it is advantageous to establish a Far Last Anti-Comintern Self-government simultaneously with the commencement of hostilities, to unite various kinds of sabotage activities by this, and to add political meanings to this."

Was not a special personnel prepared for the purpose of administering -- trained for the purposes of administration of Soviet territory which it was planned to seize with the help of the Japanese troops and was not this personnel trained under the supervision of UMEZU and the chief of the Harbin military

7/.

1	mission in 1942 Harbin Special Service Organization
2	A Such personnel was not being trained.
В	Q Will you tell whether the chief of Harbin
4	Special Service Organization was directly subordinated
5	to UMEZU as commander of the Kwantung Army?
6	A He was directly under the command of the
7	commanding general.
8	Q Did you, as chief of staff of the Kwantung
9	Army at that period, supervise the activities of
0	special service organizations?
1	A I have not engaged in their guidance.
2	Q Did you have any knowledge of the activities
3	of these special service organizations, or you forgot
4	about them?
5	A The fact that there was a conference of chiefs
6	of special service organs in 1940 does not remain in
7	my memory. I have forgotten it entirely. I do not
8	remember anything about it. February 1940.
9	Q Mr. Witness, do not you know that as early as
0	in the beginning of 1938 TOJO and UMEZU were concerned
1	with construction of fortifications directed against
2	the Soviet Union?

I do not know of them, but General UMEZU's

Yes, but in 1938 UMEZU was Vice War Minister

arrival was in September, 1939.

25

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

of Japan and was concerned with the activities of the Kwantung Army, was not he? I will remind you of it. I will read to you an excerpt from secret telegram of the chief of staff of the Kwantung Army TOJO to Vice War Minister UMEZU. I quote exhibit 719, page 1-a, second paragraph:

"The establishment of anti-Soviet fortifications is scheduled to be made during 1938 and 1939 on the spots not yet started as well as the spots regarded as specially important among the locations of fortifications mentioned in Special Order No. 301."

Did you know about the program of the construction of fortifications on the U.S.S.R. state border? THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to questions concerning fortifications in 1938 or '39 which was entirely prior to any period mentioned by this witness in his testimony in chief.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, in his affidavit the witness tries to connect the question of the construction of fortifications made on the Soviet state border at the time he was chief of staff of the Kwantung Army with another matter, with the losses which were suffered -- great losses which were suffered

25

4 5

by the Kwantung Army during the incidents of 19381939, and I think it pertinent to ask him whether the
fortifications were being built prior to the losses
of which he speaks and how does he explain the reasons
for the building of these fortifications -- correction:
prior to the losses by which he tries to explain the
building of these fortifications.

THE PRESIDENT: Refer me, will you, to the part of the affidavit on which you rely.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I withdraw this question. I refer the Tribanal to exhibit 779 and ask them to use this exhibit while estimating the value of the witness' testimony.

By this I finish my cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, in answer to the Russian prosecutor you said you did not remember or did not know of the border incidents which he alleged. Do you deny that those border incidents occurred?

THE VITNESS: There were no serious border incidents. However, there were occasions when spies crossed the border or that airplanes crashed in the vicinity of the border.

by the Kwantung Army during the incidents of 1938
1939, and I think it pertinent to ask him whether the

fortifications were being built prior to the losses

of which he speaks and how does he explain the reasons

for the building of these fortifications -- correction:

prior to the losses by which he tries to explain the building of these fortifications.

THE PRESIDENT: Refer me, will you, to the part of the affidavit on which you rely.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I withdraw this question. I refer the Tribanal to exhibit 779 and ask them to use this exhibit while estimating the value of the witness' testimony.

By this I finish my cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, in answer to the Russian prosecutor you said you did not remember or did not know of the border incidents which he alleged. Do you deny that those border incidents occurred?

THE VITNESS: There were no serious border incidents. However, there were occasions when spies crossed the border or that airplanes crashed in the vicinity of the border.

2.1

by the Kwantung Army during the incidents of 19381939, and I think it pertinent to ask him whether the
fortifications were being built prior to the losses
of which he speaks and how does he explain the reasons
for the building of these fortifications -- correction:
prior to the losses by which he tries to explain the
building of these fortifications.

THE PRESIDENT: Refer me, will you, to the part of the affidavit on which you rely.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I withdraw this question. I refer the Tribanal to exhibit 779 and ask them to use this exhibit while estimating the value of the witness' testimony.

By this I finish my cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, in answer to the Russian prosecutor you said you did not remember or did not know of the border incidents which he alleged. Do you deny that those border incidents occurred?

THE VITNESS: There were no serious border incidents. However, there were occasions when spies crossed the border or that airplanes crashed in the vicinity of the border.

2

3

14

15

16

21

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Continuing on the subject of border incidents, Mr. Witness, co we understand, then, that during the years in question there were crossings of the border by individuals or small groups?

In my recollection there were frequent cross-8 ings of the border by airplane by the Soviet Air Force: and there were also frequent incidents in which Soviet citizens -- probably soldiers; I do not know -- came into Manchukuo territory and attacked Manchurian citizens -abducted Manchurian citizens.

THE MONITOR: "Attacked" should be deleted.

What was it, "abducted"?

A Abducted.

17 Now, I refer you, Mr. Witness, to prosecution exhibit 751, from which the Soviet prosecutor quoted some figures to you. I want to call your attention to 20 the fact that this document shows that in the year 1939 there were 387 individuals, Japanese, who violated 22 the Russian frontier. That is the year, is it not, of the Nomonhan Incident?

I do not think that such a thing occurred.

But answer me. That was the year, was it not,

of the Nomonhan Incident? A Yes. 3 And the same exhibit, 751, shows that in the year 1938, 124 Japanese violated the Soviet frontier. That is the year, is it not, of the Changku-Feng Incident? 7 Yes. 8 MR. BLAKEN Y: No further re-examination. 9 May the witness be excused on the usual 10 terms? 11 THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. 12 (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 13 MR. BLAKENEY: The document referred to in 14 the last two questions should have been exhibit 750, 15 although the Clerk's copy shows it to be 751. 16 THE PRESIDENT: We have it noted as 750. 17 MR. BLAKENEY: And in connection with that 18 evidence, I wish to call attention to page 7746 of the record, where the President characterized that document 20 as "bare assertation." 21 I now call as a witness YAMAMURA, Haruo, 22 whose testimony is embodied in defense document 1152. 23

24

HARUO YAMAMURA, called as a witness 2 on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BLAKENEY: 7 Mr. Witness, please state your name and residence. 9 My address, No. 481, 4-Chome, Saginomiya, 10 Nakano-ku, Tokyo. My name, YAMAMURA, Haruo. 11 I will ask that you be handed defense document 12 1152, and that you examine that and state whether it 13 is your affidavit, signed and sealed by you? 14 This document bears my signature and seal. 15 And are the contents thereof true and correct? 16 Yes. 17 MR. BLAKENEY: The affidavit, defense document 18 1152, is offered in evidence. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 20 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1152 21 22 will receive exhibit No. 2680. (Whereupon, the document above 23 24 referred to was marked defense exhibit 25 No. 2680 and received in evidence.)

4 5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

> 17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

MR. BLAKENEY: I now read the exhibit 2680, omitting formal parts, as follows:

"I am YAMAMURA, Haruo, former Lieutenant General in the Japanese Army. From November 1941 to August 1943 I was commander of the 7th Independent Garrison Force, stationed in Chiamussu, an important place in northeastern Manchuria. My duty was to guard the Soviet-Manchurian border in Sankiang. The 7th Independent Garrison Force was under the command of General UMEZU, commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army.

"During this period General UMEZU repeatedly stressed the importance of keeping peace with the U.S.S.R., with the result that his peaceful attitude towards the U.S.S.R. was well known throughout the Kwantung Army. It was well understood by all officers and men that General UMEZU had been especially selected as Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army after the Nomonhan Incident for the purpose of insuring peace. He held frequent conferences of army commanders, division commanders and other unit commanders -- if I remember correctly, there were five or six army commanders' conferences during the time I was in Manchukuo -- at which he repeatedly instructed the commanders not to cause or permit any trouble with the Soviet forces.

MR. BLAKENEY: I now read the exhibit 2680,

2 3

4

5

8 9

10

11

12 13

> 14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

omitting formal parts, as follows:

"I am YAMAMURA, Haruo, former Lieutenant General in the Japanese Army. From November 1941 to August 1943 I was commander of the 7th Independent Garrison Force, stationed in Chiamussu, an important place in northeastern Manchuria. My duty was to guard the Soviet-Manchurian border in Sankiang. The 7th Independent Garrison Force was under the command of General UMEZU, commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army.

"During this period General UMEZU repeatedly stressed the importance of keeping peace with the U.S.S.R., with the result that his peaceful attitude towards the U.S.S.R. was well known throughout the Kwantung Army. It was well understood by all officers and men that General UMEZU had been especially selected as Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army after the Nomonhan Incident for the purpose of insuring peace. He held frequent conferences of army commanders, division commanders and other unit commanders -- if I remember correctly, there were five or six army commanders' conferences during the time I was in Manchukuo -- at which he repeatedly instructed the commanders not to cause or permit any trouble with the Soviet forces.

Such instructions were also given on every other possible occasion. General TOGAWA conveyed General UMEZU's attitude toward the Soviet at one conference as follows: 'Commander-in-Chief UMEZU, emphasizing the necessity of not causing any trouble with the Soviet, has expressed his strong intention to severely punish and discharge anyone who in any way takes a pro-

"In accordance with General UMEZU's instructions, I made every effort to impart this will to my men, and General UMEZU's principles were faithfully carried out by officers and men. At no time during my service under the Kwantung Army was there a border incident of importance.

vocative move against the Soviet.'

"The time of my arrival in Chiamussu (November 1941) was three months after the Kan-tokuen had been put into effect. However, I did not hear anything special about the Kan-tokuen from my direct superior officer, Lieutenant General TOGAWA, Jiro, Commander of the 10th Division, and I did not notice any evidence of anything out of the ordinary in the condition or attitude of the troops, or such as would indicate any expectation of fighting. In fact, as a troop commander I was somewhat concerned over the state of relaxation of the troops, in view of the danger of any possible

Soviet attack. My inspections of the border upon my arrival did not disclose any unusual signs. If attacked by the U.S.S.R. they were ready to fight to the end, as was their duty, but there was not the faintest indication of the Japanese side initiating any moves.

"Guard duty by troops stationed along the border was carried out according to the 'Sankiang District Border Guard Regulations,' which were developed from the 'Border Guard Regulations,' first formulated and laid down by General UMEZU, to fit the conditions on the spot. Even if the Soviet Union should illegally cross the border (center of the current of the Amur River) they were strictly not to be fired at. The Soviet movements were to be watched and ascertained and stopped if they came to the Manchukuoan bank of the river. Thus, utmost care was taken to avoid any fighting. Guards acting as pilots were stationed on river boats plying between Harbin and Peiho to assure completely against these vessels trespassing into Soviet territory or territorial waters.

"The area which I was responsible for guarding in Sankiang Province was very large in proportion to the number of men available for guard purposes. The 7th Independent Garrison Force had only the peacetime strength of two infantry battalions and one artillery

1 battalion, and facilities were so poor even for carry-2 | ing out defense duties that I suggested reinforcements whenever I had the opportunity to do so." 4 I should like to put one or two additional 5 questions to this witness. 6 Q What was the approximate length of the border guarded by your garrison force, Mr. Witness? 8 A Approximately 800 kilometers. 9 Q And what was your total strength in men with 10 the two infantry battalions and one artillery battlaion 11 which you mentioned? 12 A According to the organization table of two 13 infantry battalions and one artillery battalion, the 14 total strength was about 2,500 men. 15 Q And, lastly, were you ever given the reinforce-16 ments which you say that you repeatedly requested? 17 A No. 18 MH. BLAKENEY: You may cross-examine. 19 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen 20 minutes. 21 (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was 22 taken until 1500, after which the proceedings

were resumed as follows:)

24

23

G r e e 2 n 3 e r g 5 & 6 L 7 e f 1 e 9 r

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

CROSS-TXAMINATION

BY COLONEL IVANOV:

Q Mr. Witness, you were, weren't you, the commanding officer of the 7th Separate Detachment and could be present only at the conferences held by the commander of the 10th Division?

A It is not the 8th or the 10th. Yes.

Q You were not present at the conference of the commanding generals of the armies held by General UMEZU?

A I did not attend.

Q You heard from the commander of the 10th Division, General TOGAWA, Jiro, about the conferences of the commanding generals of the armies held by General UMEZU, and he told you that there were five or six such conferences at that time, is it not so?

A I know that there were five or six conferences from documents, and there were five or six within my personal knowledge.

Q Tell me, Mr. Witness, General TOGAWA, Jiro was only the commanding general of a division and could not be present at the conferences of the

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

18

19

17

commanding generals of the armies and heard about them from a commanding general of one of the armies.

A Not so. They personally attended; that is, he personally attended.

Q I repeat, at the conferences of the commanding generals of the armies which were held by General UMEZU.

A He attended those conferences.

Q Thus, all that you state in your affidavit concerning instructions issued originally by General UMEZU, you say from words of General TOGAWA, Jiro, that is, from hearsay, isn't that so?

A I heard from TOGAWA by document and personally and frequently from him verbally.

Q In your affidavit, you quote word by word the contents of General TOGAWA's speech on the attitude of General UMEZU toward the Soviet Union. Did you record this speech?

A Yes.

Q Can you, after five years, quote from memory the actual text of General TOGAWA's speech when, in your affidavit, you could not state whether it was five or six conferences that were held by General UMEZU? How can we rely on the truth of your recollections?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, his answers will not help in this matter. That is a matter for comment.

Q Do you know, Mr. Witness, that General
UMEZU was of the opinion that Japanese attitude towards the Neutrality Pact with the Soviet Union must
change as soon as changes in relations between Germany and the Soviet Union took place?

A I do not know.

Q I will read to you an excerpt from exhibit 1086 which is telegram sent by Ambassador Ott to Reich Minister Ribbentrop on June 11, 1941. That is eleven days before Germany had attacked the Soviet Union. I quote:

"Prince URACH has informed us of a conversation with the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, General UMEZU, in Hsinking: Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, General UMEZU, stressed that he welcomed the Neutrality pact Japan-Russia for the moment. Since, however, the Tripartite pact is the unchangeable basis of Japanese foreign policy, Japan's attitude towards the Neutrality pact must undergo a change just as soon as the hitherto existing German-Russian relations undergo an alteration. Ott."

Mr. Witness, what post did you hold and where

1 2

	were you in summer and autumn, 1941?				
1	A I was commander of the 13th Mixed Brigade				
2	in Central China.				
3	Q When and from whom have you heard about				
5	Kantokuen for the first time?				
6	Why do you hesitate? You mentioned this				
7	name in your affidavit.				
8	A I did not hear of it definitely from any				
9	particular porson.				
10	Q In your affidavit, you state that you				
11	arrived at Chiamussu in November of 1941. That is				
12	three months later, after Kantokuen was in force.				
13	Will you tell, then, this, what month was the				
14	Kantokuen Plan drafted and in what month of 1941				
15	was it enforced?				
16	A I recollect that it was around the end of				
17	July, 1941.				
18	Q Do you know that General UMEZU was directly				
19	connected with the effectuation of Kantokuen?				
20	A I do not understand the purport of the				
21	question very well.				
22	Q Let's pass on to the next question, then.				
23	Do you know that according to the Kantokuen				
24	the Kwantung Army received several hundred thousand				

men in reinforcements out of the number of the

mobilized persons and that establishments of all the divisions of the Kwantung Army were increased up to the pre-war size? Do you know about that?

THE PRESIDENT: He was only a garrison commander with a few battalions under him. There are others who can answer that more satisfactorily.

Q Mr. Witness, do you know that in 1941, the discharge of the officers serving their term -- soldiers -- the dischargement of soldiers having served their term was ceased?

A Yes.

Q Mr. Witness, will you tell me, was your predecessor relieved from the post of commander of the detachment and you appointed to this post -- and you were appointed on this post in connection with the Kantokuen Plan?

A I do not know enything about my predecessor, and I had no connections with the putting into effect of that plan.

Q You were commanding officer of the Separate Detachment and you didn't know that there was a plan drafted in the Kwantung Army -- a plan of a war against the USSR in 1942, confirmed by General UMEZU -- sanctioned by General UMEZU. That is why you did not speak about this question in your affi-

1	davit, is that so?
2	A I do not know anything about that.
3	Q But, you should have known that in 1942
4	in the Kwantung Army there were formed first and
5	second fronts or area armies and somewhat later,
6	third area army, wasn't it so?
7	MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please,
8	counsel is merely arguing with the witness. I do
9	not think these are proper questions.
10	THE PRESIDENT: That objection is upheld.
11	Q Mr. Witness, wasn't it because you were on
12	the unimportant sector that you didn't know anything
13	about the preparation for a war against the USSR and
14	knew so little about it and about other measures?
15	THE PRESIDENT: That negative type of
16	question, if answered, is of no assistance.
17	COLONEL IVANOV: With that, I conclude cross-
18	examination.
19	MR. BLAKENEY: May the witness be released
20	on the usual terms?
21	THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.
22	(Whereupon, the witness was ex-
23	cused.)
24	cuseu.)
25	

MR. BLAKANEY: I now call as a witness

BLAKE

Licutenant Colonel H. C. Blake of the U. S. Army. THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, has this 3 men signed an affidavit? 4 MA. BLAKENEY: No, sir. 5 THE PRESIDENT: In chambers, I told you not 6 to bother getting affidavits from these American and other western witnesses for the time being, but I do not know what view my colleagues take. 9 MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, sir. This is the wit-10 ness who was in question at that hearing in chambers. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Well, call him, and there 12 may be no objection taken. I do not know. 13 14 C. BLAKE, Lieutenant Colonel, 15 United States Army, called as a vitness on 16 behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, 17 testified as follows: 18 MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribanal please, I 19 do want to raise the objection that we have not been 20 served with copy of the affidavit. 21 MR. BLAKENEY: As I stated, there is no 22 affidavit, because the defense is relying on what

24 25

23

THE PRESIDENT: We have insisted on English

it assumed to be its right to call English-speaking

witnesses without the production of affidavits.

BLAKE

witnesses speaking on affidavits where they have had a lot to say and have produced a lot of documents. This man seems to have a lot of documents, to say the least. Perhaps I should not say we insisted. The prosecution applied to us that that course be followed, and we ordered it in spite of the defense attitude.

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes. Special permission was granted to the prosecution, and we objected then because we did not think then and we do not think now that it is conducive to the best presentation of the case in the case of English-speaking witnesses, to require their testimony to be recorded. The testimony of this witness will be quite brief, and it will be readily apparent that it could not be reduced to writing in the form of an affidevit without being objectionable under the rules of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: You said his evidence would be brief, Major Blakeney?

MR. BLAKENEY: That is correct, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: How long will it take?

MR. BLAKENEY: I assume the tostimony in chief will take thirty to forty minutes at most, perhaps less.

7 8

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, may
I be heard on the matter before there is a decision?
THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: It occurs to me that the matter of briefness of the affidavit should not be the controlling factor. When an affidavit is brief and when it is not may be a very difficult matter to determine. We see no difference in principle at all between an English-speaking witness and one who is not as far as the expedition of the trial is concerned. Distinguished counsel has stated that they relied upon their right to produce an English-speaking witness to testify by word of mouth but this does not appear to be exactly correct in view of the ruling of the President of the Tribunal in Chambers quite some time ago as to this particular witness.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not recollect what I said in Chambers other than at the time being Major Blakeney need not prepare an affidavit, but I did not know what my colleagues thought. We will hear him orally but I am basing that on Major Blakeney's assurance that his evidence will only take half an hour. We would waste more time in getting an affidavit and getting it processed and distributed, more time and material, than if we decide to hear him now and he

does not take more than half an hour. This vote, of course, is based on the fact of this particular case.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q Mr. Witness, state your name and official position, please.

A Lieutenant Colonel Homer C. Blake, Chief of the Order of Battle Section, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, General Headquarters, Far Eastern Command.

Q Is G-2, GHQ, Far Eastern Command, the Intelligence Section of General Headquarters, the official repository of various estimates of order of battle and strength of Japanese armed forces, estimates made by the United States War Department and subordinate agencies thereof during the war of 1941-1945?

A It is.

Q Are you as Chief of the Order of Battle Section of G-2 familiar with those documents?

A I am.

Q Are those estimates based upon data and sources of information available to the War Department and the field commands and commonly utilized in

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

24

25

military intelligence in compiling enemy order of battle? A They are. Did the estimates so made serve as the basis of planning for operations of the United States and Allied Fo ces during the war? They were, of course, so used. Were these estimates confirmed by information which became available upon the surrender of Japan as having been reasonably accurate? They were proved to have been reasonably accurate. For what period of time are such estimates available among the records in the custody of G-2? 1943 until 1945. Have you brought with you some of those Q estimates? A I have. Are the documents containing them subject to a military security classification? The documents contain classified military A information. I ask you to consult the documents which

you have with you and to give the Tribunal therefrom

the following data: the estimates of the strength of

the Japanese Kwantung Army and the Korea Army, 1 mentioning also the number of divisions, brigades 2 and other large units under the command of each for 3 each quarter of the years 1943-1945 inclusive. Please add the estimated number of aircraft in Manchuria and 5 Korea for each of those dates. 6 31 May 1943: 7 Manchuria -- 500,000 men, 22 divisions, 8 9 3 brigades, 7 tank regiments. Korea -- 1 division, 50,000 men. 10 11 Manchuria and Korea -- 405 planes. 12 31 July 1943 13 Manchuria -- 450,000 men, 14 divisions, 14 1 cavalry brigade, 13 border garrisons. 15 Korea -- 1 division, 45,000 men. 16 Manchuria and Korea -- 195 planes. 17 30 September 1943 18 Manchuria -- 550,000 men, 14 divisions, 19 1 cavalry brigade, 13 border garrisons. 20 Korca -- 45,000 men, 1 division. 21 Manchuria and Korea -- 216 planes. 22 31 December 1943 23 Manchuria -- 750,000 men, 14 divisions, 24 1 cavalry brigade, 13 border garrisons. 25 Korea -- 65,000 men, 2 divisions.

1			Manchuria and Korea 150 planes.	
2			31 January 1944	
3			Manchuria 750,000 men, 14 divisions,	
4	1	cavalry	brigade, 13 border garrisons.	
5			Korea 65,000 men, 2 divisions.	
6			Manchuria and Korea 316 planes.	
7			30 April 1944	
8			Manchuria 785,000 men, 13 divisions,	
9	1 .	cavalry	brigade, 13 border garrisons.	
10			Korea 100,000 men, 2 divisions.	
11			Manchuria and Korea 353 planes.	
12			31 July 1944	
13			Manchuria 700,000 men, 14 divisions,	
14	1 0	cavalry	brigade, 13 border garrisons.	
15			Korea 100,000 men, 2 divisions.	
16 17			Manchuria and Korea 180 planes.	
18			31 October 1944	
19			Manchuria 660,000 men, 14 divisions,	
20	1 0	avalry	brigade, 13 border garrisons.	
21			Korea 120,000 men, 1 division.	
22			Manchuria and Korea 139 planes.	
23			31 January 1945	
24			Manchuria 660,000 men, 9 divisions,	
25	3 0	avalry	brigades, 13 border garrisons.	
			Korea 125,000 men, no divisions.	

Manchuria and Korea -- 159 planes. 30 April 1945 Manchuria -- 610,000 men, 8 divisions, 1 cavalry brigade, 14 border garrisons. Korea -- 215,000 men, 7 divisions. Manchuria and Korea -- 205 planes. 13 August 1945 Manchuria -- 660,000 men, 16 divisions, 2 tank regiments. THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev. (Continuing) Korea -- 5 divisions, 5 depot divisions, 325,000 men.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any advantage in taking your point just at this moment?

question, your Honor. Will those documents which are now being read by the witness be produced to the Court?

THE PRESIDENT: If he is speaking from documents, and you insist, I think he must comply with the rule. Obviously, the foundation of his knowledge is documents, and documents should be produced.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I am quite satisfied, your Honor. Thank you.

IR. BLAKENEY: I do not wish by silence to suggest that the witness will produce the documents.

THE PRESIDENT: We have considerations of security, but I do not know how far they would apply in this matter at this time.

had been available to us for production we should not have troubled to put the witness on the stand to read them.

THE PRESIDENT: According to English decisions, and they are very, very late, the House

of Lords, the word of the Secretary of State or the Foreign Secretary is taken as conclusive on the question of security. But the privilege must be raised by the Foreign Secretary or the Secretary of State. However, it is for this Tribunal to

make its own laws in that regard.

MR. BLAKEMEY: I point out that the witness has already stated that the documents which he has with him do contain classified military information, and I assume that if and when the request is made of him during cross-examination, not during examination in chief, to produce the documents he can then state the position.

THE PRESIDENT: To establish the privilege he should have a letter from the State Department or the equivalent.

IR. BLAKENEY: He has no connection. He is a military man.

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose if he tells us he is instructed to take the privilege by the proper people we will not question his word.

PR. BLAKENEY: Shall he complete his direct testimony?

THE ERRESIDENT: Has to finished?
MR. BLAKEMEY: No, sir.

1 2

3

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what is the position?

Do you insist on the production of the documents?

We will have to decide this question of privilege at once. Perhaps, we will have to adjourn to enable it to be determined.

You, General Vasiliev, insist on the production of the documents, do you?

GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, your Honor, undoubtedly.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, it is for the witness to say whether he can produce them or not, having regard to his instructions from the State Department.

Honor, that this is not the proper time for the matter to be raised. He is in the midst of testifying from the documents, and I would suggest that he be permitted to complete it.

THE PRESIDENT: Once the other side claims to see the document or to have it produced, you shut down on any evidence of the document until it is produced or its absence explained or some privilege is successfully raised. But we can do nothing until the witness tells us after consulting his superiors what his attitude is on this question of privilege.

"itness, are you prepared to produce these documents without further reference to authorities?

THE "ITNESS: I am not at liberty to produce the documents, as they contain classified military information.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the Court will have to consider that question.

We will adjourn until half-past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 3 June 1947, at 0930.)

14

8

9

0

13

12

16

17

1.8

19

21

22

23

24